REMARKS

The present amendment is in response to the Office Action dated June 8, 2005. Claims 1-31 are now present in this case. Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 17, 25, 28, and 30 are amended.

The Office Action raises an objection to claim 28 due to a typographical error. The applicants wish to express their appreciation to the Examiner for discovering the error. Claim 28 has been amended to correct this minor typographical error. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the objection to claim 28 be withdrawn.

The applicants wish to express their appreciation to the Examiner for a telephone interview with the applicants' attorney on July 7, 2005. The applicants further express their appreciation to the Examiner for suggested claim language to clarify the nature of the invention.

Claims 1, 7, 9, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The applicants have amended these claims in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion to more clearly recite the nature of the invention. The specification as originally filed provides clear support for the amendment. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 7, 9, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claims 1-2, 5-10, 13-18, 21-25, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 6,700,888 to Jonsson et al. in combination of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0064164 to Barany. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration. The Office Action states that it would have been obvious to modify Jonsson in view of Barany. This is incorrect. The two references teach completely opposite and incompatible approaches to the problem. Jonsson reduces the bandwidth requirements by altering the data packet headers to be transmitted over the communication pathway. However, Jonsson transmits all headers and does not teach or suggest processing only relevant portions of extracted headers. In contrast, Barany teaches the total and complete elimination of data packet headers from the transmitted data (see Paragraph 29). If headers are

necessary for processing, a series of protocol configuration messages are sent independently of data packets that allow reconstruction of the necessary headers (see Paragraph 32). However, these configuration messages are not data headers.

Neither reference, taken alone or in combination, suggests extracting the header and using a header compressor configured to compress only relevant portions of the extracted header, as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, neither reference teaches or suggests an identification module configured to establish context identification, as recited in claim 1. Although the Office Action states that Jonsson teaches such a module, the cited portion of Jonsson is the background section that merely describes conventional data packet headers. This does not suggest an identification module configured to establish context identification using compressed relevant portions of the header. Accordingly, claim 1 is clearly allowable over the combination of Jonsson and Barany. Claims 2-6 are also allowable in view of the fact that they depend from claim 1, and further in view of the recitation in each of those claims.

Claim 7 is directed to a transmission network and recites *inter alia* "a header compressor configured to compress only relevant portions of the extracted header." As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Jonsson and Barany teach completely opposite approaches to processing data packet headers. Jonsson transmits all data packet headers although at least one data packet header is altered by violating the integrity of the header while Barany discloses a system in which all headers are completely eliminated. These diametrically opposed references are incapable of combination in the manner suggested in the Office Action and do not teach or suggest a header compressor configured in the manner recited in claim 7. Accordingly, claim 7 and dependent claim 8 are clearly allowable over the combination of Jonsson and Barany.

Claim 9 is a method claim and recites *inter alia* "compressing only relevant portions of the extracted header." As described above, Jonsson teaches a technique wherein all data headers are transmitted while Barany teaches a system in which no headers are transmitted. These references are incapable of combination in the manner suggested in the Office Action. Furthermore, even the combination does not teach or suggest the method of claim 9 wherein only relevant portions of the extracted header

are compressed. Accordingly, claim 9 is clearly allowable over the combination of Jonsson and Barany. Claims 10-16 are also allowable in view of the fact that they depend from claim 9, and further in view of the recitation in each of those claims.

Claim 17 is directed to a machine-readable medium that *inter alia* comprises instructions to "compress only relevant portions of the extracted header." As discussed above, the combination of Jonsson and Barany do not teach or suggest such a process. The machine-readable medium of claim 17 is clearly allowable over the combination of Jonsson and Barany. Claims 18-24 are also allowable in view of the fact that they depend from claim 17, and further in view of the recitation in each of those claims.

Claim 25 is a call processing method in which a header is extracted and only relevant portions of the extracted header are combined with the payload portion. Claim 25 further recites "transmitting only the relevant portions of the extracted header and the payload portion to a remote unit." As noted above, Jonsson describes a technique in which all headers are transmitted with the payload while Barany describes a system in which no headers are transmitted with the payload. These references are incapable of combination in the manner suggested in the Office Action. Furthermore, neither reference, taken alone or in combination, suggests combining only relevant portions of a header with the payload and transmitting only the relevant portions of the extracted header and the payload, as recited in claim 25. Therefore, claim 25 is clearly allowable over the combination of Jonsson and Barany. Claims 26-31 are also allowable in view of the fact that they depend from claim 25, and further in view of the recitation in each of those claims.

Claims 3, 4, 11, 12, 19, 20, 26, 27, and 29-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Jonsson and Barany further combined with U.S. Patent No. 6,879,599 to Galyas. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration. The irrelevance of the combination of Jonsson and Barany has already been discussed above with respect to claims 1, 7, 17, and 25. Galyas is cited for purportedly teaching that a header compressor compresses only a payload type header. This is incorrect. The section of Galyas cited in the Office Action refers to Figure 3B, which clearly shows that much more than simply

a frame type header is transmitted. Furthermore, the cited section of Galyas describes a compressed payload, but does not suggest data header compression in general and, more specifically, compressing only a payload type header field as recited in several of the rejected claims. Accordingly, claims 3, 4, 11, 12, 19, 20, 26, 27, and 29-31 are allowable over the combination of Jonsson, Barany, and Galyas.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the subject application and its allowance are kindly requested. If questions remain regarding the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (206) 628-7640.

Respectfully submitted,
Alok K. Saxena et al.
Davis Wright Tremaine LLP

Michael J. Donohue
Registration No. 35,859

MJD:gatc

Enclosures:
Power of Attorney
Statement Under 37 CFR 3.73(b)

2600 Century Square
1501 Fourth Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98101-1688
Phone: (206) 622-3150
Fax: (206) 628-7699

1657749_1.DOC